## REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 15, 19-28, 31 and 35 are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 15-21 and 25-35 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (US 6,868,358); Claims 22 and 23 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Brown in view of Lin et al. (US 2002/0024432); and Claim 24 was rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Brown in view of Boesch (US 6,118,369). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as set forth below.

Claim 15 is amended herein to include the limitations of claims 16 and 18 and additional limitations that further define the claimed method. Support for these amendments is present, for example, in original claims 16 and 18 and paragraphs [0029] and [0008] of the specification.

Claims 16-18, 29, 30 and 32-34 are canceled. Claims 19-21 are amended to change their dependencies, in light of the amendments to claim 15.

Applicants submit that the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 15. In particular, Brown does not disclose the following features of claim 15:

> wherein one or more conditions are checked as a precondition for identification of the tire filling pressure, including at least one of the ignition having been restarted following the vehicle having been stationary, a wheel sensor detected a pressure change when the

vehicle was stationary, and a wheel that has newly been fitted to the vehicle is detected,

wherein the characteristic change in the tire pressure value occurs when the difference between the determined tire pressure value and the stored nominal value is greater than a predetermined threshold value for at least two wheels, and

wherein, when the tire pressure changes in a manner characteristic of a filling process, the stored nominal value is automatically replaced by a new nominal value if the determined tire pressure value is classified as plausible

Brown does not disclose "wherein one or more conditions are checked as a precondition for identification of the tire filling pressure, including at least one of the ignition having been restarted following the vehicle having been stationary, a wheel sensor detected a pressure change when the vehicle was stationary, and a wheel that has newly been fitted to the vehicle is detected." In particular, Brown does not disclose any preconditions being checked for identification of tire filling pressure. Furthermore, Brown does not disclose the particular preconditions claimed in claim 15. Instead, Brown simply discloses checking tire pressures and leak rates.

With regard to the feature of "wherein the characteristic change in the tire pressure value occurs when the difference between the determined tire pressure value and the stored nominal value is greater than a predetermined threshold value for at least two wheels," the Office Action asserts that Brown discloses this feature in col. 1, lines 62-67; col. 15, line 62 – col. 16, line 25. *See Office Action, pg. 3 (re claim 18).* Applicants respectfully disagree. The excerpt at col. 1, lines 62-67, states:

> The purpose of a tire monitoring system is to provide the driver with a warning should an anomaly occur in one or more tires. Typically tire pressure and temperature are reported parameters. To be useful, the information must be quickly communicated and be reliable. However, displaying data derived from raw sensor measurement of temperature

Although this excerpt mentions that an anomaly may occur in one or more tires and that a driver can be warned about the anomaly/anomalies, this is only a general disclosure of warning about tire anomalies. Such a general disclosure does not correspond to the specific feature of amended claim 15 of a characteristic change in the tire pressure value occurring when the difference between the determined tire pressure value and the stored nominal value is greater than a predetermined threshold value for at least two wheels.

Furthermore, the other cited excerpt (col. 15, line 62 – col. 16, line 25) of Brown also fails to disclose this feature of the claim. Instead, it describes a process of determining an amount of time left before a gauge pressure or temperature compensated pressure value (data point) crosses a threshold value, categorizing the data points into two states, and generating a warning signal when the proportion of data points in one state exceeds a "time left" threshold. Accordingly, both of the cited excerpts fail to teach or suggest the relationship between the characteristic change in the tire pressure value occurring and the difference between the determined tire pressure value and the stored nominal value being greater than a predetermined threshold value for at least two wheels.

Also, Brown does not disclose "wherein, when the tire pressure changes in a manner characteristic of a filling process, the stored nominal value is automatically replaced by a new nominal value if the determined tire pressure value is classified as plausible." Instead, Brown discloses replacing a gauge pressure with a filtered cold pressure value, without classifying whether the gauge pressure is plausible. Brown simply measures the gauge pressure and corrects the measured value for load, temperature and environmental pressure. *See col. 7, lines 39-47.*

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that amended claim 15 is patentable over Brown.

Claims 19-21, 25-28 and 31 are patentable due to their dependence from claim 15.

With respect to claim 35, Applicants respectfully submit that Brown does not disclose or suggest "when the temporal course of a change in air pressure follows a pattern that is indicative of a filling of the tire by an operator, replacing the stored nominal value by a new nominal value, with the determined tire pressure value being used to establish the new nominal value." In particular, Brown does not make a determination of whether the temporal course of a change in air pressure follows a pattern that is indicative of a filling of the tire by an operator. Instead, it simply detects a pressure value and adjusts the detected pressure value based on the load, temperature, and environmental pressure, regardless of whether the change in air pressure follows a pattern that

is indicative of a filling of the tire. Additionally, although Brown's adjusted pressure value (i.e., filtered pressure value) is compared to a pressure threshold value, and a warning is output if the filtered pressure value is outside of the pressure threshold value, the filtered pressure value is not replaced by the pressure threshold value against which it is compared. Therefore, claim 35 is patentable over Brown.

Applicants submit that claims 22-24 are patentable over the prior art due to their dependence from claim 15 and because the Lin and Boesch references fail to make up for the above-described deficiencies of Brown.

## Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 095309.57883US).

Respectfully submitted,

October 1, 2008

Gary R. Edwards
Registration No. 31,824
Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

CROWELL & MORING, LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
GRE:CWB:crr
*6384545*